DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 201 95 TM 005 159

AUTHOR Bergeth, Robert L.
TITLE Minneapolis Public Schools 1975 Title I Summer School Program: An Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of School Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Education for the Disadvantaged.
REPORT NO C-74-15
PUB DATE Dec 75
NOTE 33p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Compensatory Education Programs; Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Objectives; Mathematics; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Reading; *Student Attitudes; *Summer Schools
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *Minneapolis Public Schools; Minnesota (Minneapolis)

ABSTRACT

The objectives of the Minneapolis summer school program, which was aimed at those youngsters showing the greatest need as determined by the fall 1974 needs assessment, were to maintain and/or improve the reading skills; math skills; attitudes toward school, reading, math, and self of Title I students. This study is based on randomly selected pre-3rd grade and pre-4th grade students who were tested at the beginning and end of summer school. Key findings were: (1) it appears that the reading skills of pre-3rd and pre-4th graders were either maintained or improved; (2) the reading objective was also met or exceeded as determined by the student's performance on the Dolch Word List; (3) while students appeared to make progress in reading, there were still many students who couldn't identify words which were introduced to them in their initial reading books in Book A (pre-primer 1) and Book B (pre-primer 2); (4) student attitudes toward summer school were very positive; (5) student attitudes toward reading and math were generally positive and little or no difference existed between the pre- and posttest. A number of recommendations were given. A student Attitude Questionnaire was appended. (Author/BJG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED120201

Minneapolis Public Schools

1975 Title I Summer School Program
An Evaluation

Robert L. Bergeth, Ph.D.
Mid-America Research Associates

This evaluation was performed under the terms of a contract with the Minneapolis Public Schools. Title I, ESEA funds helped to support this evaluation.

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TM005 159

C-74-15
December 1975

Research and Evaluation Department
Planning and Support Services
807 N. E. Broadway
Minneapolis, MN 55413

Minneapolis Board of Education
W. Harry Davis, Chairperson

Marilyn A. Borea — Carol R. Lind — John M. Mason
Phillip A. Olson — James W. Pommerenke — Jane A. Starr

Interim Superintendent
Donald D. Bevis

Special School District No. 1

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

An Equal Opportunity Employer

THE MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
1975 TITLE I SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM
AN EVALUATION

SUMMARY

See Pages

The 1975 Minneapolis Public School Title I summer school program served approximately 3,000 Title I students and was aimed at those youngsters showing the greatest need as determined by the fall 1974 needs assessment. 1

The objectives of the summer school program were:

1. To maintain and/or improve the reading skills of Title I students.
2. To maintain and/or improve the math skills of Title I students. 1
3. To maintain and/or improve attitudes toward school, reading, math and self.

The summer school program lasted six weeks. Four hours of instruction were provided each day. Programs were located in 16 public elementary centers, six non-public elementary centers, and four junior high centers. The evaluation focused on student reading skills and attitudes. 1

A budget of $500,000 was provided to operate the program. Most of the funds were assigned to reading. Math programs received about one-third of the funds. About $43,000 was spent for other programs. 1

This study is based on 123 randomly selected pre-3rd grade and pre-4th grade students who were tested at the beginning and end of summer school. 2

The following were the key findings from this study:

1. It appears that the reading skills of pre-3rd and pre-4th graders were either maintained or improved. Thus, a key overall Title I summer objective was achieved. Students' instructional reading levels were maintained and fewer reading errors were made on the Informal Reading Inventory on the posttest than the pretest. 24

2. The reading objective was also met or exceeded as determined by the students' performance on the Dolch Word List. The median student identified correctly 80% of the words on the posttest compared to 74% on the pretest. The Dolch Word List consisted of 207 words and the group as a whole improved the number of words they identified correctly on the posttest by 188 words; i.e., 91% of the words given were improved on the posttest compared to the pretest. 24

3. While students appeared to make progress in reading, there were still many students who couldn't identify words which were introduced to them in their initial reading books in Book A (pre-primer 1) and Book B (pre-primer 2). These are books usually introduced at the first stages of reading instruction either in kindergarten or first grade (see Tables 2 and 3 and accompanying text narrative). 24

4. Student attitudes toward summer school were very positive. Seventy-six percent found summer school "really good" on the posttest compared to 84% on the pretest. The overall liking of school dropped slightly at the end of school compared to the beginning. 24

5. Student attitudes toward reading and math were generally positive and little or no difference existed between the pre- and posttest. 24

A number of recommendations were given. 25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
THE EVALUATION RATIONALE	1
THE POPULATION SURVEYED AND TEST ADMINISTRATION PROCEDURES	2
WHAT INSTRUMENTS WERE USED?	3
The Dolch Basic Sight Word List	3
Informal Reading Inventory	5
Attitudinal Survey	6
THE RESULTS	6
Objective: To Maintain and/or Improve Student Reading Skills	6
Did the Students' Attitude Toward Reading, Math, Summer School, and Self Decline, Remain the Same or Improve?	20
KEY FINDINGS SUMMARY	24
RECOMMENDATIONS	25
REFERENCES	26
APPENDIX	27

DO NOT FILM THIS PAGE

LIST OF TABLES

Number		Page
1	Reading Instructional Level on the Pretest and Posttest as Determined by the Score on the Informal Reading Inventory	7
2	Percent of Dolch Basic Sight Words Correctly Identified on Pretest and Posttest.	9
3	Percent of Dolch Basic Sight Words Correctly Identified in Order of Appearance in the American Book Reading Series.	15
4	How Do Students Rate Reading, Math and Summer School at the Beginning and End of Summer School?.	21
5	How Do Students Feel About Themselves?.	23

THE MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
1975 TITLE I SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM:
AN EVALUATION

The 1975 Minneapolis Public School Title I summer school program served approximately 3,000 Title I students and was aimed at those youngsters showing the greatest need as determined by the fall 1974 needs assessment.

The objectives of the summer school program were:

1. To maintain and/or improve the reading skills of Title I students.
2. To maintain and/or improve the math skills of Title I students.
3. To maintain and/or improve attitudes toward school, reading, math, and self.

The programs were planned at each building level, but were aimed at reaching the objectives of the overall summer school program. Thus, reading and math programs were offered in all schools.

The summer school program lasted six weeks and four hours of instruction was provided each day. Programs were located in 16 public elementary centers, six non-public elementary centers, and four junior high centers.

The planning for the program was done by a broad based committee composed of teachers, parents, principals and consultants meeting on a regular basis from November 1974 through March 1975.

A budget of $500,000 was provided to operate the program. About two-thirds of the funds were allotted for reading programs and one-third went to math programs. About $43,000 was spent for other programs.

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the effectiveness of the summer school program.

THE EVALUATION RATIONALE

Two goals of the summer school program were selected by the Summer School Committee and form the thrust of this evaluation. This evaluation attempted to determine whether or not the Title I summer school program met the expected program outcomes listed below:

1. To maintain and/or improve the reading skills of Title I students.
2. To maintain and/or improve attitudes toward school, reading, math, and self.

Reading objectives were selected for evaluation because the majority of the budget was devoted to the reading program.

Because of the short duration of the Title I summer school program, it was decided that norm referenced tests would not yield accurate measurements.

Therefore, it was decided that one of the best measures of reading progress would be to give the students an Informal Reading Inventory and check their instructional reading level at the beginning and end of the program.

Grades pre-3 and pre-4 were chosen because it was felt that the reading progress of these students could be more accurately assessed with this approach.

Growth and/or maintenance of reading skills was determined by the instructional reading level at both the pre- and posttest. In addition, when there was no gain in instructional reading level, the number of errors was recorded. Progress was determined if there was a reduction in reading errors at the time of the posttest.

Students reading growth was also determined by the number of words the students were able to accurately read and pronounce at the beginning and end of the summer school from the Dolch Basic Sight Word List. An increase in the number of words correctly read and pronounced, meant improvement in reading skills.

Students attitudes toward school, reading, math, and self also were determined by the administration at an attitude scale at the beginning and end of summer school. Attitude maintenance or improvement was determined by the posttest score. The goal of the summer school was met if the group posttest score was equal to or higher than the pretest group score.

THE POPULATION SURVEYED AND TEST ADMINISTRATION PROCEDURES

Pre-third and pre-fourth graders from ten Title I public elementary summer schools were randomly selected for inclusion in the study from 16 public elementary schools which participated in the program. The selected schools were: Bancroft, Bethune, Bremer, Cleveland, Harrison, Irving, Lowell, Lyndale, Putnam, and Standish. Parochial schools and secondary schools were not included in the study. Approximately 12 Title I students (six boys, six girls) in grades pre-3 and pre-4 were randomly selected from a list of Title I students provided by the principal of each school. One hundred twenty-three of 439 students in the ten schools were given both a pretest and posttest and comprised the sample. There were approximately 700 pre-third and pre-fourth graders in the 16 participating elementary schools. Thus, the sample comprised 18% of the total population of public elementary third and fourth graders who attended summer school.

The students were in attendance at school 26.9 days out of a possible 30 days for an attendance percentage of 89.7. Time between testing was 17.7 days of school.

All tests (reading and attitudes) were administered individually to each student at each school by two qualified research assistants. The assistants were master degree teachers who received their degrees in reading and who taught reading.

WHAT INSTRUMENTS WERE USED?

The Dolch Basic Sight Word List

The English language is comprised of many phonetically irregular words which do not lend themselves to regular phonic analysis. Pupils must rely almost totally upon rote memorization of such words (Anderson, 1968). The ability to recognize "service" or "sight" words such as "have", "the", and "were" is necessary to read even the simplest sentences at beginning reading levels (Durkin, 1970).

Perhaps the most widely used sight vocabulary is the one compiled by Dr. Edward W. Dolch, which consists of 220 basic words that comprise approximately 65% of the words of the typical primary readers (Cushenberry, 1971; Otto and McMenemy, 1966). According to Dolch, the list may well be called "basic" because it included the "service" words that are used in all writing, regardless of subject matter (Dolch, p. 254). The basic sight words are those which a child knows, not because of their initial sounds or any specific word attack skills, but merely by rote memory. By the middle of the third-grade level, the average reader should be expected to know by sight the 220 Dolch words (Barbe, 1972). The list also has significance beyond the third-grade level, for the percentage of frequency of use drops only to about 60% through the intermediate grades (Otto and McMenemy, 1966).

The Dolch Basic Sight Word List was checked against samplings of textbooks in four subjects. It was found to include 70% of the words in first-grade books, about 65% of those in second and third-grade books, and about 60% of the words in most of the books for grades four through six (Dolch, 1960).

The list consists of conjunctions, prepositions, pronouns, adverbs, adjectives, and verbs. Nouns are not included in the list, since their

usage is not universal for all subject matter. Some nouns recur often, but are related to a particular interest (Dolch, 1960). Dolch suggests that perhaps one reason many children in the intermediate grades do not know the words on the list by sight is that emphasis on sight-teaching has been on nouns instead of on "sight" words.

The Dolch list has considerable utility, because once it has been mastered, it enables pupils to apply their mastery in most other connected reading efforts and to gain considerable fluency at an early stage of the instructional sequence. Early successful experiences enhance the likelihood of future positive experiences in reading attempts (Otto and McMenemy, 1966).

Pupils were individually tested on the Dolch Basic Sight Word List for the pretest and posttest. One purpose for administering the test was for the examiner to ascertain the pupil's approximate instructional reading level before administering the Informal Reading Inventory. According to Dechant (1970, p. 465), if a pupil knows up to 75 of these words, he may be reading at a pre-primer level; up to 120, on the primer level; up to 170, on the first reader level; up to 210, on the second reader level; up to 220, on the third reader level.

A second purpose for administering this test of Dolch Sight Words was to provide data for possible comparisons between the Dolch vocabulary and the vocabulary introduced in the American Book Company Basal Readers used in the Minneapolis Title I Reading Program. The Dolch words have been referenced according to the basal level in the ABC series where they are introduced.

The procedure in administering and scoring the Dolch test was as follows:

1. The first 207 of the 220 Dolch words, listed in ascending order of difficulty, were presented to the subject on 3" x 5" cards attached to a 3" notebook ring to facilitate the rapid turning of the cards.
2. Subjects were given approximately two seconds to pronounce the word that appeared on the card presented, or about as much time as it took to move the word card from one side of the ring over to the opposite side, where the card was turned face-down.
3. Subjects were given credit for knowing the word if they could pronounce it correctly instantly or if they corrected the word immediately after mispronouncing it, either as the word card moved to the opposite side of the ring or as the word card turned face-down.

4. Subjects were stopped after making five consecutive errors. Words following the fifth consecutive error were recorded as errors. Pupils continued through the entire list of 207 words if they did not make five consecutive errors.

5. To record words incorrectly pronounced or unknown, the examiner positioned the "incorrect" word cards at a 90° angle from the "correct" words on the ring. Errors were recorded later on the scoresheet in the spaces corresponding to the numerals on the Dolch word cards.

Informal Reading Inventory

For this project the Informal Inventory selections were taken from the American Book Company series. This series is the basal reading text which is used in the Title I schools in Minneapolis. The American Book Company books begin at Level A (pre-primer 1) and continue alphabetically through Level L (sixth grade reader).

The purpose of the Informal Oral Reading Inventory was to determine the instructional reading level of a student. The inventory was administered individually. A pretest was given during the first two weeks of summer school and a posttest was given four weeks later. The test administrator was the same for the pre- and posttest.

In order to determine the student's instructional level during the pretest, the student was asked to read orally from a selection. The errors the student made were recorded on a teacher recording sheet. Each particular book level selection has a designated number of errors that provide the criteria to move up to another level. If the student was asked to read a selection that was obviously too difficult, the student was stopped and asked to read a lower level selection that was more appropriate. If a student made less than the designated number of errors on the score norm, the student was asked to move up to another selection until the appropriate instructional level was found.

The types of errors that were recorded included omissions, substitutions, insertions, reversals, pronunciation errors, and repetitions. If a student hesitated for more than three seconds, the word was pronounced by the examiner and it was recorded as an error. The comprehension questions were not used.

During the posttest the student was asked to read the selection that had been determined as that student's instructional level during the pretest. The number of errors made was recorded. If the student

read fluently with little or no error, the student was asked to read the next higher selection and the errors from that level were recorded.

Attitudinal Survey

All students tested individually were given an attitudinal questionnaire by the research assistants. The questionnaire is of the semantic differential type. Each student was asked how he felt about a certain topic such as reading. Five different pairs of bi-polar adjectives were used to assess his/her feeling on the topic. A five-point equal interval scale was used for each set of adjectives (see attached copy of the questionnaire in the Appendix). Five is the most positive rating possible and one the most negative.

The total score for each set of adjectives on each topic determines whether attitudes were maintained or improved from pretest to posttest. The higher the score the more improvement shown.

THE RESULTS

The following was listed as an objective of the Title I summer school program.

Objective: To Maintain and/or Improve Student Reading Skills

Maintaining and or improving student reading skills was one of the objectives of the Title I summer school program. There were several ways of determining whether this objective was met. One of the ways was to see if the students improved their instructional reading level. Table 1 presents the pre- and posttest data for this.

Table 1

Reading Instructional Level on the Pretest and Posttest as Determined by the Score on the Informal Reading Inventory[a]

Book Level of the American Book Company Reading Series	Pretest (N=123)		Posttest (N=123)	
	N	%	N	%
A (Pre-primer 1)	4	3%	4	3%
B (Pre-primer 2)	2	2	2	2
C (Pre-primer 3)	6	5	6	5
D (Primer)	5	4	4	3
E (1st reader)	30	24	29	24
F (2^1 reader)	28	23	30	24
G (2^2 reader)	15	12	12	10
H (3^1 reader)	13	11	16	13
I (3^2 reader)	14	11	12	10
J (4th reader)	6	5	8	7
K (5th reader)	0	0	0	0
L (6th reader)	0	0	0	0
Book Level for Median Student	F		F	
Reading Number of Errors Made at Instructional Level F	13.3		9.4	

[a]Percents may not total 100 because of rounding.

On the basis of the data presented in Table 1, it can be concluded that the instructional reading level of the students was about the same at the end of the program as at the beginning. Thus, the objective of the reading program was met.

Seventy-three percent of the students read at or below the G reading level on the pretest and 71% on the posttest. Fourteen percent read below Book E (1st reader) on the pretest and 13% read below E on the posttest. Only five percent read at the J (4th reader) level on the pretest and seven percent read at or above J on the posttest. The median for both the pre- and posttest was Book F (2^1 reader). Book F is the first of two books read in second grade.

Book F was the median reading level of the students. On the pretest the students made 13.3 reading errors on the average, and on the posttest, 9.4. Thus, the students, while not improving their instructional reading level, did commit fewer reading errors on the posttest.

How well did the students perform on the Dolch Basic Sight Word List? Table 2 provides insight into how well the students performed on the Dolch Word List. Table 2 indicates the percentage of students who identified correctly each word on the pretest and posttest. The Dolch words in Table 2 are listed in order of those identified by the greatest percentage of students on the pretest. For example, 99% of the students could identify the words "a", "I", "two", "in", "and", "yellow" and "he". However, only 46% could identify the words "upon" and "want". Thus, an item analysis is provided and the percentage identifying each word correctly can be ascertained.

It should be emphasized that all the Dolch Words had been introduced to the students by the time they had completed Book G. This is the second of two books read at the second grade in the American Book Company reading series.

It appears that the students made progress as measured by the Dolch Word List. An analysis of Table 2 shows that the students improved on the posttest on 188 of the 207 words or 91% of the words. For 13 words (six percent) there was no change and for six words (three percent) more students correctly identified the words on the pretest than on the posttest.

Table 2

Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying Each Word of the Dolch Basic Sight Word List at the Beginning and End of Summer School
N=123

Dolch Word Number	American Book Company Level Where Word is Introduced	Dolch Word	Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying the Word Pretest	Posttest
1	A	a	99%	100%
2	A	I	99	100
5	A	two	99	99
7	A	in	99	99
10	A	and	99	9[illegible]
14	A	yellow	99	99
15	A	he	99	98
4	A	to	98	99
8	A	see	98	98
12	A	blue	98	98
13	A	she	98	96
16	A	go	98	98
17	A	you	98	98
20	A	red	98	99
30	B	can	98	97
6	A	the	97	98
11	B	up	97	98
19	B	big	97	98
22	A	it	97	98
23	B	play	97	97
27	A	is	97	97
3	D	too	96	99
18	A	we	96	98
21	B	jump	96	98
38	D	one	96	96
43	A	so	96	96
9	C	into	95	98
28	A	me	95	97
34	B	be	95	96
42	C	all	95	94
45	B	do	95	94
50	A	green	95	98
31	B	good	94	93
36	A	not	94	96
29	C	look	93	97
39	B	black	93	93
46	C	are	93	92
47	B	him	93	95
58	B	going	93	97
49	A	on	92	94
44	B	by	91	94
25	C	for	90	93
41	A	at	90	92
32	B	brown	89	98
35	D	today	89	93
37	E	little	89	93

Table 2 (continued)

Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying Each Word of the Dolch Basic Sight Word List at the Beginning and End of Summer School
N=123

Dolch Word Number	American Book Company Level Where Word is Introduced	Dolch Word	Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying the Word Pretest	Posttest
40	B	my	89%	94%
57	B	that	89	92
61	D	like	89	92
67	B	yes	89	96
75	A	get	89	91
26	E	old	88	92
53	B	said	88	90
59	C	did	88	93
33	G	six	87	95
54	C	away	87	90
74	A	ten	87	92
87	C	walk	87	90
24	E	down	86	87
62	E	come	86	88
78	E	its	86	88
89	D	out	86	89
51	E	eat	85	91
72	B	was	85	91
73	D	just	85	87
76	C	if	85	90
81	E	fly	85	91
88	B	stop	85	93
90	B	his	85	90
99	A	will	85	90
60	D	who	84	92
65	A	no	84	92
70	C	this	84	90
106	C	funny	84	87
52	G	four	83	89
56	C	they	83	88
63	D	had	83	89
83	D	but	83	88
91	D	make	83	89
94	E	help	83	87
68	B	an	82	87
77	D	[illegible]	82	84
48	E	her	81	87
95	C	call	81	90
55	D	run	80	87
64	B	say	80	88
101	B	them	80	85
119	D	ask	80	86
105	B	white	79	83
108	D	take	79	84
110	B	saw	79	85
130	D	have	79	83
102	B	when	78	81

Table 2 (continued)

Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying Each Word of the Dolch Basic Sight Word List at the Beginning and End of Summer School
N=123

Dolch Word Number	American Book Company Level Where Word is Introduced	Dolch Word	Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying the Word Pretest	Posttest
82	A	then	77%	88%
84	D	as	77	85
118	B	what	77	83
66	E	long	76	85
71	D	around	76	81
92	E	your	76	87
97	E	sleep	76	81
79	D	some	75	85
86	E	before	75	85
93	D	ride	75	82
114	B	with	75	86
116	D	about	75	82
126	A	let	75	82
139	E	right	75	77
80	D	from	74	85
111	D	or	74	83
132	E	keep	74	82
113	D	work	73	81
134	B	sit	73	81
100	D	pretty	72	82
115	E	there	72	80
122	A	five	72	83
129	C	well	72	76
133	E	drink	72	77
103	D	round	71	76
69	E	three	70	81
107	E	put	70	78
109	C	of	70	83
120	E	sing	70	83
121	D	must	70	79
136	D	went	70	80
140	B	why	70	72
135	D	made	69	76
147	C	tell	69	77
98	E	cold	68	75
125	E	cut	67	77
128	F	new	67	81
137	D	has	67	77
138	F	seven	67	79
159	A	not	67	75
85	E	under	66	73
104	B	am	66	78
127	F	again	66	72
146	D	us	64	72
123	G	myself	63	73
124	E	over	63	73

Table 2 (continued)

Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying Each Word of the Dolch Basic Sight Word List at the Beginning and End of Summer School
N=123

Dolch Word Number	American Book Company Level Where Word is Introduced	Dolch Word	Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying the Word Pretest	Posttest
141	E	please	63	67
161	E	light	63	69
198	D	out	63	69
169	C	fall	62	66
170	D	think	62	69
173	E	read	62	67
143	F	give	61	72
149	E	where	61	69
175	F	best	61	67
182	A	got	61	70
194	E	pick	61	66
154	E	now	60	69
163	G	pull	60	68
167	E	find	60	70
179	E	off	60	70
188	B	try	60	71
96	D	here	59	76
112	B	ran	59	80
131	E	how	59	76
150	E	many	59	67
160	F	open	59	63
162	E	their	59	65
164	B	may	59	70
165	E	goes	59	64
178	E	fast	59	68
186	C	show	59	69
187	E	any	59	64
195	D	don't	59	67
202	E	clean	59	62
190	B	wish	58	70
117	F	after	57	68
153	E	live	57	68
205	D	those	57	62
171	D	far	56	65
176	F	because	56	63
185	E	does	56	65
204	F	never	56	63
157	F	very	55	65
158	E	would	55	63
177	E	grow	55	68
189	E	kind	55	64
145	G	together	54	64
166	E	small	54	70
168	E	could	54	63
172	D	found	54	63
181	E	bring	54	64
183	F	always	54	59

Table 2 (continued)

Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying Each Word of the Dolch Basic Sight Word List at the Beginning and End of Summer School
N=123

Dolch Word Number	American Book Company Level Where Word is Introduced	Dolch Word	Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying the Word	
			Pretest	Posttest
201	D	better	54%	67%
207	D	first	54	63
144	F	once	53	61
184	G	much	52	59
200	F	thank	52	61
206	F	write	52	58
151	F	warm	51	61
148	F	ate	50	55
156	G	buy	50	54
180	D	draw	50	63
196	F	every	50	59
197	E	which	50	63
152	E	laugh	49	56
155	E	came	49	65
193	F	only	49	60
192	C	know	48	64
191	F	carry	47	57
142	G	upon	46	63
199	E	want	46	55
203	F	been	44	51
174	D	were	29	49

Table 3 shows the same information presented in Table 2 except that the order of the Dolch Word List has been changed to the order in which the words were introduced to the students in their basic readers; i.e., all words from Book A are presented first, then Book B, etc.

It is interesting to note that even words which are introduced at the pre-primer level such as those in Books A and B frequently give students a problem even when they are going into the third and fourth grade. For example, the word "got" is introduced in Book A (pre-primer) and yet only 67% of the students could correctly identify it on the pretest and only 75% on the posttest.

Pre-primer words (Book B) "may", "try" and "wish" were also bothersome. Only 59% of the students could correctly identify "may" on the pretest but did improve considerably on the posttest (70% identified if correctly). The word "try" was identified correctly by only 60% on the pretest and 71% on the posttest. The word "wish" improved from 58% on the pretest to 70% on the posttest. Thus, while the students may seem to perform poorly, they did make substantial improvement on the posttest for certain words.

The word "got" which appears in Book A (pre-primer) is not introduced until the 182nd word in the Dolch List. "May" was the 164th word introduced by Dolch, "try" the 188th word and "wish" the 190th word.

A careful inspection of each word in Table's 2 and 3 will reveal the most difficult or troublesome words for students.

Table 3

Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying Each Word of the Dolch Basic Sight Word List with Words Arranged in Order of Appearance in the American Book Company Reading Series
N=123

American Book Company Reading Series Level	Dolch Word	Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying the Word	
		Pretest	Posttest
A	a	99%	100%
	I	99	100
	to	98	99
	two	99	99
	the	97	98
	in	99	99
	see	98	98
	and	99	99
	blue	98	98
	she	98	96
	yellow	99	99
	he	99	98
	go	98	98
	you	98	98
	we	96	98
	red	98	99
	it	97	98
	is	97	97
	me	95	97
	not	94	96
	at	90	92
	so	96	96
	on	92	94
	green	95	98
	no	84	92
	ten	87	92
	get	89	91
	then	77	88
	will	85	90
	five	72	83
	let	75	82
	not	94	96
	got	67	75
B	up	97%	98%
	big	97	98
	jump	96	98
	play	97	97
	can	98	97
	good	94	93
	brown	89	98
	be	95	96
	black	93	93
	my	89	94
	by	91	94
	do	95	94
	him	93	95
	said	88	90

Table 3 (continued)

Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying Each Word of the Dolch Basic Sight Word List with Words Arranged in Order of Appearance in the American Book Company Reading Series

N=123

American Book Company Reading Series Level	Dolch Word	Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying the Word Pretest	Posttest
B	that	89%	92%
	going	93	97
	say	80	88
	yes	89	96
	an	82	87
	was	85	91
	stop	85	93
	his	85	90
	them	80	85
	when	78	81
	am	66	78
	white	79	83
	saw	79	85
	ran	59	80
	with	75	86
	what	77	83
	sit	73	81
	why	70	72
	may	59	70
	try	60	71
	wish	58	70
C	into	95%	98%
	for	90	93
	look	93	97
	all	95	94
	are	93	92
	away	87	90
	they	83	88
	did	88	93
	this	84	90
	if	85	90
	walk	87	90
	call	81	90
	funny	84	87
	of	70	83
	well	72	76
	tell	69	77
	fall	62	66
	show	59	69
	know	48	64
D	too	96%	99%
	today	89	93
	one	96	96
	run	80	87
	who	84	92
	like	89	92
	had	83	89

Table 3 (continued)

Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying Each Word of the Dolch Basic Sight Word List with Words Arranged in Order of Appearance in the American Book Company Reading Series
N=123

American Book Company Reading Series Level	Dolch Word	Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying the Word	
		Pretest	Posttest
D	around	76%	81%
	just	85	87
	soon	82	84
	some	75	85
	from	74	85
	but	83	88
	as	77	85
	out	63	69
	make	83	89
	ride	75	82
	here	59	76
	pretty	72	82
	round	71	76
	take	79	84
	or	74	83
	work	73	81
	about	75	82
	ask	80	86
	must	70	79
	have	79	83
	made	69	76
	went	70	80
	has	67	77
	us	64	72
	think	62	69
	far	56	65
	found	54	63
	were	29	49
	draw	50	63
	don't	59	67
	out	63	69
	better	54	67
	those	57	62
	first	54	63
E	down	86%	87%
	old	88	92
	little	89	93
	her	81	87
	eat	85	91
	come	86	88
	long	76	85
	three	70	81
	its	86	88
	fly	85	91
	under	66	73
	before	75	85
	your	76	87

Table 3 (continued)

Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying Each Word of the Dolch Basic Sight Word List with Words Arranged in Order of Appearance in the American Book Company Reading Series

N=123

American Book Company Reading Series Level	Dolch Word	Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying the Word	
		Pretest	Posttest
E	help	83%	87%
	sleep	76	81
	cold	68	75
	put	70	78
	there	72	80
	sing	70	83
	over	63	73
	cut	67	77
	how	59	76
	keep	74	82
	drink	72	77
	right	75	77
	please	63	67
	where	61	69
	many	59	67
	laugh	49	56
	live	57	68
	now	60	69
	came	49	65
	would	55	63
	light	63	69
	their	59	65
	goes	59	64
	small	54	70
	find	60	70
	could	54	63
	read	62	67
	grow	55	68
	fast	59	68
	off	60	70
	bring	54	64
	does	56	65
	any	59	64
	kind	55	64
	pick	61	66
	which	50	63
	want	46	55
	clean	59	62
F	after	57%	68%
	again	66	72
	new	67	81
	seven	67	79
	give	61	72
	once	53	61
	ate	50	55
	warm	51	61
	very	55	65

Table 3 (continued)

Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying Each Word of the Dolch Basic Sight Word List with Words Arranged in Order of Appearance in the American Book Company Reading Series
N=123

American Book Company Reading Series Level	Dolch Word	Percentage of Students Correctly Identifying the Word	
		Pretest	Posttest
F	open	59%	63%
	best	61	67
	because	56	63
	always	54	59
	carry	47	57
	only	49	60
	every	55	65
	thank	52	61
	been	44	51
	never	56	63
	write	52	58
G	six	87%	95%
	four	83	89
	myself	63	73
	upon	46	63
	together	54	64
	buy	50	54
	pull	60	68
	much	52	59

Did the Students' Attitude Toward Reading, Math, Summer School, and Self Decline, Remain the Same or Improve?

How much did the students' attitude in reading change? Apparently little change in attitudes toward reading occurred from the prettest to the posttest. Table 4 presents the results. The overall grand mean rating given to reading on the pretest was 4.1 compared to 4.0 on the posttest. The average student in the sample liked reading. (Five is the most positive and one the most negative rating).

Thus, students attitudes toward reading dropped slightly (.1 point) on the posttest.

How much did the students' attitudes toward math change? There was no difference in attitudes toward school as measured pre- and posttest. The overall grand mean was 4.1 for both the pre- and posttest. A rating of 4.1 is a positive rating.

Apparently most students like math pretty well.

How much did the students' attitudes toward summer school change? Overall, the students liked summer school very much. The overall grand mean was 4.5 on the pretest and 4.3 on the posttest. Thus, while there was a .2 point drop on the posttest, the students as a whole liked summer school. Seventy-six percent found it "really good" on the posttest compared to 84% on the pretest.

Table 4

How Do Students Rate Reading, Math and Summer School at the Beginning and End of Summer School?[a]
N=123

Rating	Rating Value	Reading is		Math is		Summer School is	
		Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
Really good	5	54%	50%	67%	56%	84%	76%
Kind of good	4	31	29	18	27	10	15
Neither	3	7	13	5	8	3	5
Kind of bad	2	5	5	7	5	2	3
Really bad	1	2	2	3	4	2	1
Mean Value		4.3	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.7	4.6
Really nice	5	58%	49%	58%	58%	74%	62%
Kind of nice	4	33	31	28	27	19	27
Neither	3	4	13	5	7	3	6
Kind of awful	2	3	3	7	3	1	2
Really awful	1	2	4	2	5	2	3
Mean Value		4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.6	4.4
Really interesting	5	50%	47%	55%	56%	65%	62%
Kind of interesting	4	29	28	30	25	25	19
Neither	3	5	9	3	9	4	8
Kind of uninteresting	2	13	12	10	7	3	8
Really uninteresting	1	3	3	2	4	2	3
Mean Value		4.1	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.5	4.3
Really pleasant	5	44%	46%	50%	55%	65%	62%
Kind of pleasant	4	34	32	31	18	24	20
Neither	3	8	13	8	14	6	8
Kind of unpleasant	2	9	6	7	9	1	6
Really unpleasant	1	5	4	4	4	3	5
Mean Value		4.0	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.5	4.3
Really easy	5	29%	30%	31%	37%	46%	38%
Kind of easy	4	34	26	23	23	32	26
Neither	3	7	19	9	16	11	17
Kind of hard	2	27	20	30	17	9	15
Really hard	1	3	5	7	7	2	4
Mean Value		3.6	3.6	3.4	3.7	4.1	3.8
Grand Mean Value		4.1	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.5	4.3

[a]Percents may not total 100 because of rounding.

How do the students' feel about themselves? Table 5 presents the results for this question. The major finding was that there was no change in the students' attitudes toward themselves as measured at the beginning and end of summer school. The overall mean was 3.8 on both the pre- and posttest. A rating of 3.8 is a positive rating on a five-point scale with one the lowest and five the highest possible rating.

Table 5
How Do Students Feel About Themselves?[a]
N=123

I am	Rating Value	Pretest	Posttest
Really smart	5	24%	28%
Kind of smart	4	41	35
Neither	3	24	27
Kind of dumb	2	10	9
Really dumb	1	1	1
Mean		3.8	3.8
Really good	5	46%	42%
Kind of good	4	34	35
Neither	3	10	15
Kind of bad	2	10	7
Really bad	1	1	1
Mean		4.1	4.1
Really happy	5	53%	53%
Kind of happy	4	30	25
Neither	3	6	13
Kind of sad	2	8	7
Really sad	1	3	2
Mean		4.2	4.2
A leader	5	11%	12%
Kind of a leader	4	24	22
Neither	3	26	16
Kind of a follower	2	32	40
Really a follower	1	8	10
Mean		3.0	2.9
Really successful	5	33%	26%
Kind of successful	4	44	46
Neither	3	8	11
Kind of unsuccessful	2	11	14
Really unsuccessful	1	4	3
Mean		3.9	3.8
Grand Mean		3.8	3.8

[a]Percents may not total 100 because of rounding.

KEY FINDINGS SUMMARY

This study reflects the degree to which pre-3rd and pre-4th grade Title I summer school students reached the Title I summer school objectives. The two objectives which this study focused on were:

1. To maintain and/or improve the reading skills of Title I students.
2. To maintain and/or improve attitudes toward school, reading, math, and self.

In the main, these objectives were met or exceeded by the Summer School Program.

The following conclusions may be made on the basis of the facts reported earlier in the text:

1. It appears that the reading skills of pre-3rd and pre-4th graders were either maintained or improved. Thus, a key overall Title I summer objective was achieved. Students' instructional reading levels were maintained and fewer reading errors were made on the Informal Reading Inventory on the posttest than the pretest.

2. The reading objective was also met or exceeded as determined by the students performance on the Dolch Word List. The Dolch Word List consisted of 207 words and the group as a whole improved the number of words they identified correctly on the posttest by 188 words; i.e., 91% of the words given were improved on the posttest compared to the pretest.

3. While students appeared to make progress in reading, there were still many students who couldn't identify words which were introduced to them in their initial reading books in Book A (pre-primer 1) and Book B (pre-primer 2). These are books usually introduced at the first stages of reading instruction either in kindergarten or first grade (see Tables 2 and 3 and accompanying text narrative).

4. Student attitudes toward summer school were very positive. Seventy-six percent found summer school "really good" on the posttest compared to 84% on the pretest. The overall liking of school dropped slightly at the end of school (4.3 rating) compared to the beginning (4.5).

5. Student attitudes toward reading were generally positive. There was practically no difference between beginning and ending of summer school attitudes toward reading. The overall pretest rating was 4.1 compared to 4.0 on the posttest. Both would be considered positive ratings although there was a slight drop on the posttest.

6. Student attitudes toward math were also positive and no overall difference existed between the pretest and posttest. The overall rating on both was 4.1 which is positive.

7. Students in the main had positive attitudes towards self although not as high as their ratings of school, reading and math. No overall difference existed between the pre- and posttest. The overall mean was 3.8 in both instances.

8. While the overall group attitudes towards self, math, reading and school were positive, there were a number of students who had negative feelings about themselves in certain areas. For example, on the posttest, nine percent felt they were "kind of dumb", seven percent said they were "kind of bad", were sad (seven percent) and "kind of unsuccessful" (14%). Seven percent reported reading as "kind of bad" or "really bad" and nine percent said the same about math. Many (15%) found reading to be uninteresting. Eleven percent had these same feelings about math and summer school.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Set more difficult summer school objectives. Since the objectives were met, this evaluator believes more difficult objectives could be set for next year. Research indicates that goals in which one has a 50% chance of achieving results are the greatest motivation to those attempting to reach them. Goals too easy to reach or those too difficult to meet, provide little or no motivation to the persons involved in reaching them.

2. The overall goal of improving attitudes for all children should be changed to identifying those with the poorest attitudes and working with them rather than the whole group. Since summer school is short, it is felt that zeroing in on specific youngsters will provide the best results for those most in need.

3. Since many basic words are not known by many students, it is recommended that Title I summer school administrators carefully examine Tables 2 and 3 and identify those words which are most troublesome and difficult for students. Further, that they develop a plan of action which will bolster the curriculum, if not during the regular school year at least during the summer school, so that these students will learn the basic words which are necessary if reading skills are to improve.

4. The words introduced in the American Book Company beginning reading series (such as Books A, B, C and D) should be reviewed to see if many of the words are too difficult for Title I readers in their beginning reading stages. This study has shown that many words introduced in the American Book Company pre-primer stages are not introduced in the Dolch Word List until about the 150th word. If this is the case, then a book series with less difficult vocabulary should be used.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Verna. Reading and young children (2nd ed.). Toronto: Collier-Macmillan, 1969, p. 161.

Barbe, Walter. Educator's guide to personalized reading instruction. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972, p. 93.

Cushenberry, Donald. Reading improvement in the elementary school. West Nyack, N. Y.: Parker Publishing Company, 1971, p. 68

Dechant, Emerald. Improving the teaching of reading. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970, p. 465.

Dolch, Edward. Teaching primary reading. Champaign, Illinois: The Garrard Press, 1960, pp. 254-265.

Durkin, Delores. Teaching them to read. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970, P. 203.

Otto, Wayne, and McMenemy, Richard. Corrective and remedial teaching. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966, pp. 142-144.

Minneapolis Public Schools

TITLE I SUMMER SCHOOL
STUDENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX

(1-6) _____ Student I.D. Number

(7) Sex

___1. Male
___2. Female

(8) Age

___1. Seven
___2. Eight
___3. Nine
___4. Ten
___5. Eleven

(9) Race

___1. White
___2. Black
___3. Other minority

CIRCLE HOW YOU FEEL MOST OF THE TIME

Most of the time READING IS

	Really	Kind of	Neither	Kind of	Really	
(10) Good	5	4	3	2	1	Bad
(11) Nice	5	4	3	2	1	Awful
(12) Uninteresting	1	2	3	4	5	Interesting
(13) Pleasant	5	4	3	2	1	Unpleasant
(14) Hard	1	2	3	4	5	Easy

Most of the time MATH IS

(15) Good	5	4	3	2	1	Bad
(16) Nice	5	4	3	2	1	Awful
(17) Uninteresting	1	2	3	4	5	Interesting
(18) Pleasant	5	4	3	2	1	Unpleasant
(19) Hard	1	2	3	4	5	Easy

Most of the time SUMMER SCHOOL IS

(20) Good	5	4	3	2	1	Bad
(21) Nice	5	4	3	2	1	Awful
(22) Uninteresting	1	2	3	4	5	Interesting
(23) Pleasant	5	4	3	2	1	Unpleasant
(24) Hard	1	2	3	4	5	Easy

Most of the time I AM

(25) Smart	5	4	3	2	1	Dumb
(26) Good	5	4	3	2	1	Bad
(27) Sad	1	2	3	4	5	Happy
(28) Follower	1	2	3	4	5	Leader
(29) Successful	5	4	3	2	1	Unsuccessful

(30) 1 2 (Circle 1 if Pretest; circle 2 if Posttest)

33